

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is in response to the Official Action dated December 5, 2006. Claims 1-13 and 15-20 are currently pending in connection with the present application. Claims 1, 8, and 13 are independent claims. In this amendment, claims 8 and 13 have been amended, and claim 14 has been canceled. Reconsideration and allowance is requested in consideration of the following remarks.

No new matter has been added by this Amendment. Furthermore, no new claim matter has been added to the existing claims. Therefore, none of the amendments include subject matter that would necessitate further search. Applicant submits that support for the added features is found in Applicant's original claims. In particular, claim 8 has been amended to better describe a method conforming with the apparatus of claim 1. In addition, claim 14 has been incorporated into claim 13, such that claim 13, as amended, discloses the subject matter of former claim 14.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates that claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant notes that these claims are allowable in their own right, and not simply for the reasons set forth in the Office Action.

Applicant submits that amended independent claim 13 now incorporates former allowable claim 14. Therefore, amended independent claim 13 and the corresponding dependent claims are also allowable, in view of the Examiner's previous consideration of allowability of the subject matter added to these claims.

Furthermore, it is submitted that claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, and 15-20 are also allowable in view of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

At least for the following reasons, if the allowance of the claims is not forthcoming and a new ground of rejection made, then a **new non-final Office Action** is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 13, and 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Kamiya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,001,690). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 8 has been amended to claim similar subject matter as claim 1, which is hereinafter argued without amendment.

Moreover, allowable claim 14 has been wholly incorporated into claim 13 to form amended claim 13. Accordingly, based on the Examiner's previous indication of allowability, claim 13 is now allowable.

With respect to claim 1, the examiner alleges that Kamiya discloses "a spindle chassis (motor base) 11 for rotationally supporting a turntable 13 on which an optical disc 10 ... is placed; a pickup chassis (head base) 24 rotationally supported on the spindle chassis (figure 13a), for movably supporting an optical pickup device 12..."

With respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that Kamiya fails to teach or suggest "*a spindle chassis for rotationally supporting a turntable on which an optical disk... is placed.*" While Kamiya teaches a disk motor 11, applicant submits that a disk motor is not a chassis. By definition, a chassis is a supporting structure. A chassis does not exert a driving force. Applicant does not disclose, nor would it be logical to disclose, a chassis for rotating a turntable. Furthermore, in the present case, Applicant has claimed a chassis that rotationally *supports* the turntable (i.e. it allows the table to rotate), not a chassis that rotationally drives the turntable.

Applicant further submits that Kamiya fails to teach or suggest, “*a pickup chassis rotationally supported on said spindle chassis*,” as recited in claim 1. Kamiya discloses that base 25 of the tilt mechanism comprises a head base 24 and a subbase 26, and is constructed such that the head base 24 and the optical pickup 12 are supported by the subbase 26 (column 4, lines 37-40). Applicant submits that Kamiya fails to teach or suggest that the subbase is in any way supported by the spindle motor (which the Examiner compares to Applicant’s spindle chassis). Furthermore, Kamiya in no way discloses that the spindle motor is mounted on head base 24. Therefore, Kamiya cannot disclose that the pickup chassis is supported by the spindle chassis.

Kamiya therefore fails to disclose, teach, or suggest various features of independent claim 1. For similar reasons, independent claim 8 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by Kamiya (although claims 1 and 8 should be interpreted solely based upon the limitations set forth therein).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, and 13 and dependent claims 4, 5, 9, 10, and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes a one month extension fee is due with this response. However, if no check is submitted with this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-1688 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Amendment Transmittal  
Petition for Extension of Time (1 month)